

Unknown Protein: Eating Bugs in a World Where Nobody Knows for Sure

Douglas C. Youvan

doug@youvan..com

www.youvan.ai

November 25, 2025

This paper begins from an awkward admission: neither writer nor reader can say with confidence whether insects are already threaded, here and there, through the global food system in ways that go beyond a few novelty snacks and traditional cuisines. We know what labels say, what corporate spokespeople insist, what regulators claim to enforce, and what meme-makers swear is happening behind the scenes. We do not know how many small substitutions have been trialed, what was buried in technical annexes, or how many quiet experiments were folded into “proprietary blends” and “natural flavors.” In that sense, “you will eat the bugs” is less a fact than a symptom of a wider problem: in long, opaque supply chains, citizens are often reduced to guesswork. Rather than pretending to resolve the question, this paper treats it as an x-ray of a dystopian information environment. Using insects as the chosen uncertainty, we explore what it means to inhabit a world where food, policy, marketing, and online narrative no longer line up cleanly, and where even a bag of grasshoppers from an ethnic supermarket can feel more honest than a shrink-wrapped bar coded as “high-protein snack.” The goal is not to settle the bugs, but to map the not-knowing.

Keywords: entomophagy, unknown protein, information dystopia, you will eat the bugs, conspiracy theories, Klaus Schwab, World Economic Forum, supply chains, labeling, proprietary blends, meme culture, Ranch 99, processed food, trust, epistemic uncertainty, alternative protein, class anxiety, stewardship, Christian ethics, future of food, soft dystopia.

A collaboration with GPT-5.1-Thinking-Extended. 37 pages. CC4.0.

Outline

1. Introduction: Living in the Protein Fog

- 1.1 A bag of grasshoppers and a bar code
- 1.2 From ingredients we can see to proteins we cannot trace
- 1.3 Bugs as a test case for not knowing

2. How We Lost Track of Dinner: Supply Chains as Black Boxes

- 2.1 From farm and market to factories, tankers, and vats
- 2.2 How many hands touch a snack before it reaches a shelf
- 2.3 The point along the chain where an insect could disappear

3. Labels, Loopholes, and the Art of Saying Almost Enough

- 3.1 “Natural flavors,” “protein blend,” and other flexible phrases
- 3.2 Novel ingredients, technical annexes, and regulatory lag
- 3.3 How much disclosure is enough to be legal, not enough to be clear

4. Bugs as Symbol, Not Ingredient (Or So We Are Told)

- 4.1 Policy papers, pilot projects, and corporate slide decks
- 4.2 Insects marketed openly versus insects whispered about
- 4.3 When a hypothetical becomes a rumor and then a certainty

5. Three Scenarios: Explicit Bugs, Stealth Bugs, and Only Accidents

- 5.1 World A: insects are rare, labeled, and mostly novelty
- 5.2 World B: insects seep quietly into blends and binders
- 5.3 World C: nothing much changed, but belief did

6. The Schwabverse: Central Planners, Pods, and Protein Narratives

- 6.1 Why “you will eat the bugs” attached itself to one institution
- 6.2 Ownership, mobility, and diet as a single imagined package
- 6.3 The psychological comfort of assuming someone, somewhere, is in charge

7. Grasshoppers You Can See vs. Powder You Cannot

- 7.1 Buying whole insects in a market with eyes open
- 7.2 Processed foods, distance, and the erosion of direct trust
- 7.3 Why a clear bag of grasshoppers can feel less dystopian than a snack bar

8. Ethics, Theology, and the Question of What We Swallow Unseen

- 8.1 Locusts in scripture and the moral status of small creatures
- 8.2 Stewardship, consent, and the difference between gift and trick
- 8.3 Pride, humility, and the temptation to despise “low” foods while accepting “high” ignorance

9. Coping Strategies in the Age of Unknown Protein

9.1 Reading labels like a lawyer and still not being sure

9.2 Shortening the chain: whole foods, local suppliers, small lies instead of big ones

9.3 Psychological posture: between apathy, obsession, and dark humor

10. If They Are Feeding Us Bugs: What Changes, What Does Not

10.1 Bodily consequences: nutrition, allergy, and the mundane

10.2 Social consequences: class, stigma, and who eats what without knowing

10.3 Spiritual consequences: trust, betrayal, and the habit of suspicion

11. If They Are Not Feeding Us Bugs: The Dystopia Was Information All Along

11.1 The cost of living in permanent maybe

11.2 How much damage a rumor can do without being true

11.3 What the bug question reveals about our whole information ecology

12. Conclusion: Unknowns, Dinner, and the Freedom to Laugh Anyway

12.1 What insects, real or imagined, taught us about food and trust

12.2 Modest proposals for a less opaque plate

12.3 Final reflections on living with partial knowledge without giving up agency

13. References

1. Introduction: Living in the Protein Fog

1.1 A bag of grasshoppers and a bar code

The story begins in a place that did not feel dystopian at all: a Ranch 99 supermarket in San Jose, fluorescent lights humming, tiled floor slightly sticky, aisles packed with jars and packets whose labels were only partly readable if you did not read Chinese. Somewhere between the dried fish and the snack foods sat a clear plastic bag of grasshoppers. They were not theory. They were not “alternative protein.” They were simply there, legs and wings still visible, stacked in a way that made it obvious what they used to be. You picked them up with a mixture of curiosity and trust: if your wife grew up with these, if her family ate them, if the price tag was ordinary rather than exotic, that was enough. The bag did not pretend to be anything else. No bold type screamed “high protein,” no corporate logo draped itself in sustainability. It was just a bag of bugs.

Now place that bag next to a modern snack bar with a glossy wrapper and a bar code. The bar exists in a very different world. Its ingredients are filtered through marketing, legal review, and supply-chain logistics. Its “protein blend” may come from peas, soy, dairy, or something more novel. You have to work harder to know what is actually inside. The bar code promises efficiency and traceability, but for the ordinary buyer it is the opposite: a black-and-white square that says “trust the system” rather than “here are the wings and legs.” The grasshoppers in the bag are visually confronting but conceptually simple. The bar is visually reassuring and conceptually opaque.

1.2 From ingredients we can see to proteins we cannot trace

Over a few generations, the dominant pattern in industrialized societies has shifted from food you recognize to food you infer. A whole fish looks like a fish. A grasshopper looks like an insect. Even ground meat still vaguely resembles something that once had muscle and bone. But once we move into processed products, ingredients become abstractions. Protein becomes a number on a label rather than a recognizable piece of an animal or plant. The logic is understandable: processing allows longer shelf life, greater convenience, cheaper calories, and a level of consistency that raw markets rarely provide. The cost is that our direct, sensory link to what we are eating erodes.

In that environment, the idea of “unknown protein” becomes plausible. When companies speak of “proprietary blends,” “novel sources,” and “innovative ingredients,” they are not lying; they are also not telling the whole story in plain language. Regulatory frameworks insist on a certain level of transparency, but they are built on categories and thresholds that ordinary people rarely read or understand. A small fraction of an ingredient may disappear into a catch-all term. An experimental protein source may appear in pilot markets long before it is widely recognized. By

the time something has been milled, fractionated, hydrolyzed, texturized, and extruded, the human brain no longer maps it back to any particular organism.

That gap between what the supply chain knows in principle and what the customer can know in practice is where speculation thrives. If proteins arrive as powders, isolates, and concentrates traded in bulk across borders, the question “Where did this come from?” becomes harder to answer, even for conscientious actors. The point is not that insects must already be everywhere, but that the structure of the system makes it hard to rule anything out with confidence. The more our diets depend on invisible intermediates and global logistics, the more any claim about “what they are feeding us” becomes both thinkable and unprovable from the outside.

1.3 Bugs as a test case for not knowing

Insects are a strangely perfect object for this uncertainty. They sit at the intersection of ecology, economics, and emotion. Biologically, they make sense as a protein source: small, fast-growing, and able to convert waste into biomass. Economically, they appeal to planners who think in terms of land use, feed efficiency, and carbon footprints. Psychologically, they are loaded with disgust, folklore, and associations with filth or plague. If you wanted to choose one ingredient that could carry the entire weight of public anxiety about hidden changes to the food system, you would have a hard time doing better than bugs.

That is why this paper adopts insects not as a known fact, but as a diagnostic question. Do we know whether large-scale producers are using insect-derived proteins in forms we would not easily recognize? Maybe yes, maybe no. Different readers will give different answers, depending on which authorities they trust, which documents they have read, and how they interpret silence. The deeper issue is that it is now easy to imagine such a substitution happening out of sight. Whether or not it has already occurred at scale, the mere plausibility reveals a fracture in our relationship to food and information.

Treating bugs as a test case allows us to explore that fracture without pretending to resolve it. If we insist on certainty, we end up either defensively repeating corporate assurances or aggressively asserting rumors as truth. If we admit not-knowing, we can ask better questions. Why are supply chains so opaque that this scenario feels possible? Why do processed foods demand trust that has not been earned? Why does a clear bag of grasshoppers, bought in an ethnic supermarket decades ago, sometimes feel more honest than a neatly wrapped protein bar on a modern shelf? In this sense, “Are they feeding us insects?” is less about insects themselves and more about whether we still have any reliable, visible grip on what we are swallowing.

2. How We Lost Track of Dinner: Supply Chains as Black Boxes

2.1 From farm and market to factories, tankers, and vats

There was a time, not all that long ago, when “supply chain” was called something simpler: the way food got from the field to the market. A farmer grew something, brought it to a stall, and you pointed at the fish, the chicken, the greens you wanted. If there was a middleman, you probably knew his name. The distance between the person who slaughtered the animal and the person who cooked it was measured in streets, not continents. You did not know every detail, but your ignorance was bounded. A cow looked like a cow, and the piece of meat you bought clearly came from it.

That arrangement did not scale well to growing cities and global trade. Step by step, processing moved away from the point of sale. Slaughterhouses were pushed out of sight. Grain went to mills; milk went to factories; fruits went to canneries and cold storage facilities. What began as specialization for efficiency slowly turned into a network of factories, tankers, containers, silos, and vats. Each node in that network was designed for throughput and stability, not for narrative. The point was to deliver a consistent product at predictable cost, not to tell a story about every ingredient.

In that world, the primary visible interface became the supermarket shelf. The long journeys of oils, starches, proteins, and sweeteners were compressed into a single rectangle of packaging and a label the size of a postcard. Even if every step in the system were honest and well-regulated, the structure itself would still encourage abstraction. A tanker of anonymous oil is not “olive grove” or “soy field,” it is just a commodity in a database. A vat of protein isolate is not “field of peas” or “school of fish,” it is just a lot number. What comes out the other end may be perfectly safe and nutritious, but it no longer carries an obvious connection to any particular living thing.

2.2 How many hands touch a snack before it reaches a shelf

To get a sense of how many opportunities for ignorance this creates, imagine tracing a single “high-protein snack” from origin to shelf. The company whose name is on the wrapper might not grow anything themselves. They buy protein isolates from one supplier, oils from another, flavorings and sweeteners from several more. Those suppliers in turn buy raw materials from growers and processors in multiple countries. A single batch of powder might combine soy from one region, peas from another, and various additives from a third. Each handoff is documented somewhere, but the entire path is rarely visible to any one person.

Along the way, ingredients are mixed, split, recombined, and repurposed. A factory may produce several different brands and products from the same base materials. Cleaning protocols are designed to prevent contamination, but the practical reality is that lines, tanks,

and hoppers are shared. A given lot of protein may be diverted into bars, shakes, and baked goods, all with different marketing stories. At each step, the ingredient moves farther from its biological origin and deeper into a world of codes, certificates, and internal spreadsheets.

By the time a buyer picks up the finished snack, dozens of people and several companies have touched its components: farmers, mill operators, truck drivers, warehouse staff, lab technicians, quality-control managers, brokers, factory workers, packagers, and retailers. Most of these people are not villains. They are doing their job within a system that rewards volume, cost control, and adherence to standards. Yet the sheer number of hands ensures that no single person carries the whole picture. If you asked everyone in the chain, “What exactly is in this bar?” each could answer for their part, but no one could put their hand on their heart and narrate the entire journey from soil to shelf.

This fragmentation is not unique to food; it is the signature of complex industrial systems. But in the case of something we put into our bodies, the psychological effect is particular. We are primates evolved to trust things we can see, smell, and recognize. In a supply chain made of metal tanks and shipping containers, we are asked instead to trust documents, procedures, and brands. For many people, that trust runs thin. When rumors arise about hidden substitutions or novel ingredients, they land not in a vacuum but in an environment where opacity is already the norm.

2.3 The point along the chain where an insect could disappear

If one wanted to imagine where an insect-based ingredient might enter this system without attracting much attention, the most likely spot would not be the supermarket or even the visible factory floor. It would be at the stage where foods are turned into standardized inputs: powders, oils, flours, concentrates. At that point, a protein is not “cricket” or “soy” in any intuitive sense; it is a specification on a technical sheet: percentage protein, moisture content, solubility, functional properties. The original organism has already been reduced to numbers.

From the perspective of the system, these inputs are interchangeable so long as they behave correctly in recipes and meet safety standards. A formulation might read “protein isolate A” or “functional protein blend,” with the exact composition determined by cost, availability, and performance. If a supplier began to offer an insect-derived isolate that matched the performance characteristics of an existing product, and if regulations allowed its use, the switch could in principle be made at this level. The end product’s ingredient list might change from one generic term to another equally opaque one, without any visible transformation in taste, texture, or appearance.

Whether this has happened, or is happening, is precisely what we do not know with certainty. Regulations in many jurisdictions would at least require certain declarations; allergic risk would

make total secrecy unlikely and legally dangerous. But from the outside, the structural vulnerability remains. Once food becomes modularized and traded as anonymous lots, it becomes possible for major changes in biological origin to be flattened into minor changes in terminology. The insect does not disappear biologically, but it disappears symbolically. It is no longer a creature on a plate; it is just another entry in a purchasing system.

The point of outlining this is not to claim that every bar hides a grasshopper, but to show how the architecture of modern food makes such a move conceptually easy and publicly hard to verify. When critics speak of “being fed bugs without consent,” they are pointing, clumsily or not, at this deeper unease: that somewhere, in the gap between the farm and the shelf, decisions about ingredients can be made in rooms they will never see, and the results will reach their bodies in forms they cannot visually decode. In that sense, the hypothetical insect is standing in for a very real question about control, information, and how far we have drifted from looking dinner in the eye.

3. Labels, Loopholes, and the Art of Saying Almost Enough

3.1 “Natural flavors,” “protein blend,” and other flexible phrases

If the supply chain is the body of the system, then the label is its face: composed, curated, and trained not to give too much away. The modern ingredient list is a compromise between three forces: regulatory demands for disclosure, marketing’s desire for simplicity and appeal, and the engineer’s wish to keep formulas flexible. Out of that push and pull come phrases that feel informative while actually doing the opposite.

“Natural flavors” is the classic example. It sounds wholesome, as if someone squeezed a lemon directly into a vat. In practice it can mean a complex mixture of compounds extracted, distilled, fractionated, or synthesized from any number of plant or animal sources, as long as the original molecule can be traced back to something that once grew or lived. “Spices,” “seasoning,” and “aromas” perform a similar function: they cordon off a cluster of ingredients into a term that fits on one line and does not scare anyone. You know that something is providing taste. You do not know what it is.

Protein has its own vocabulary of obscurity. “Protein blend,” “protein matrix,” “functional protein,” or “plant-based protein complex” are phrases that tell you almost nothing about which organisms the amino acids came from. At most, a label may list a few primary sources in descending order, but even then the ratios can change over time. A manufacturer can swap one isolate for another, adjust proportions, or introduce a new component without altering the brand story. The language is deliberately modular: it describes function more than origin.

In theory, regulators can insist that insect-derived ingredients be named explicitly. In practice, those requirements are filtered through the same logic that produced “natural flavors” and “protein blends”: groupings, categories, and terms that collapse difference. If an insect extract can be legally described as a flavoring, or a protein powder, it could, in principle, share these umbrella terms with more familiar substances. Nothing overtly false is printed; it is simply that the level of resolution is too low for a lay reader to see where one kind of protein ends and another begins.

3.2 Novel ingredients, technical annexes, and regulatory lag

Behind the short ingredient list live documents most shoppers will never see. When a company wants to use a new ingredient, especially one that has not been widely consumed in a given region, it may need to submit dossiers, toxicology data, and manufacturing descriptions to regulators. Approvals might take the form of entries in “novel foods” catalogs, “generally recognized as safe” determinations, or technical annexes to existing regulations. These texts are often long, dry, and written for specialists. They are the place where an insect, if it is present at all, will show up under its Latin name and processing method.

Once an ingredient has threaded its way through that process and been granted a status, it becomes part of the regulatory landscape. It acquires a code, a category, and sometimes a maximum permitted use level. At that point, it can migrate into products under whatever naming conventions the law allows. The public-facing label will carry only the outermost shell of this bureaucratic history. A line of text on a wrapper may represent dozens of pages of technical description, but there is no obligation to connect those dots for the consumer in plain speech.

Innovation moves faster than law. New protein sources, processing methods, and extraction technologies are constantly being proposed. Regulators, constrained by staff, procedure, and political pressure, update their frameworks more slowly. In the gap between what engineers can do and what statutes explicitly anticipate, there is room for interpretation. Is a powdered insect protein more like a traditional food, or more like an additive? Does it belong under the same heading as a plant concentrate, or does it require a separate category? Different jurisdictions may answer differently, and companies will naturally favor readings that give them flexibility.

The result is not necessarily a conspiracy; it is a landscape of grey zones. Even when everyone plays by the rules as written, those rules can leave wide spaces where the technical truth is locked in annexes and the ordinary shopper sees only a single word: “protein,” “flavor,” “color.” The question “Are there insects in here?” might have a well-documented answer buried in a regulatory database, but the path from that answer to the label in your hand is long and indirect.

3.3 How much disclosure is enough to be legal, not enough to be clear

Lawyers and marketers both understand that there is a difference between avoiding fraud and providing understanding. Disclosure requirements are built around minimum thresholds: allergens that must be highlighted, certain classes of additives that must be named, claims that must be backed by files on request. Meeting those requirements is enough to avoid sanctions. It does not guarantee that a typical reader will walk away with an accurate mental picture of what they are about to eat.

This is where the art of “saying almost enough” comes in. A label can technically list every required component while still leaving the overall impression fuzzier than it needs to be. An insect-derived ingredient might be rendered as a scientific term that few recognize. A blend could be given a generic name that obscures its changing composition. Claims like “no artificial flavors” can be strictly true if all flavor molecules originate from biological sources, even if the process by which they arrive in the product would surprise most people.

From the company’s perspective, this ambiguity is a feature. It preserves room to reformulate in response to price shocks, availability issues, or new opportunities, without having to redesign the entire brand. It avoids triggering reflexive disgust or controversy when an ingredient, though legal and safe, falls outside what a target market considers “normal.” It keeps competitors from easily copying exact ratios. The label becomes a kind of negotiated silence: enough information to satisfy the letter of the law, not enough to anchor the imagination.

For the consumer, the effect is cumulative. Each individual phrase might be defensible, but taken together they create an atmosphere of partial knowledge. You know that there is protein, but not from whom. You know that flavors are natural, but not from what. You know that regulators have signed off, but not when, how, or under what assumptions. In that atmosphere, rumors about hidden insects thrive because they exploit a real asymmetry: one side has functional knowledge of the system; the other side has packaging and trust.

The central tension of this section is not that labels are full of outright lies. It is that they are optimized for compliance and persuasion, not for clarity. The law asks, “Have you disclosed what you must?” People ask, “Do I actually understand what this is?” Between those two questions there is room for a grasshopper, or for the anxious suspicion of one, even if it never touches the production line.

4. Bugs as Symbol, Not Ingredient (Or So We Are Told)

4.1 Policy papers, pilot projects, and corporate slide decks

If you go looking for insects in official documents, you will not find a villain’s manifesto. You will find PDFs. They have titles about “sustainable protein,” “future food systems,” and “resilient

supply chains.” They are full of charts, infographics, and pictures of smiling children holding bowls of something that might or might not contain crickets. In this ecosystem, insects appear as bullet points: efficient feed conversion, lower greenhouse gas emissions, potential to valorize waste streams. They are data points in a larger argument about how to squeeze more calories and protein out of a stressed planet.

Pilot projects follow a similar script. Somewhere, a government agency or development organization funds a small program: insect farms in rural areas, school lunches with cricket flour, black soldier fly larvae processing organic waste into animal feed. The scale is modest, the language earnest. Reports speak of “proof of concept,” “technology transfer,” and “community acceptance.” These are not secret; they are simply not widely read. Most people never see the grant proposals, the conference posters, or the pilot evaluations. For those who do, insects are just one tile in a mosaic of interventions.

Corporations, especially those with sustainability departments and a presence at global forums, build their own slide decks. Insects may occupy a single box on a crowded “innovation pipeline” slide: alongside algae, lab-grown meat, precision fermentation, and improved legumes. The tone is speculative rather than declarative. Phrases like “exploring,” “evaluating,” and “long-term potential” abound. No one writes “we have decided to replace your beef with beetles.” They write, instead, about “portfolio diversification” and “emerging ingredients.” It is all conditional verbs and future tenses.

Seen from inside these documents, bugs are not a plot but an option. Seen from outside, they can look like the thin edge of a wedge. When you gather enough of these PDFs, pilot reports, and decks into a mental pile, a pattern emerges: many institutions appear to be thinking along the same lines about protein. Whether that pattern represents a coordinated push, a shared conclusion, or merely convergent logic is precisely the kind of question that cannot be confidently answered from the sidewalk.

4.2 Insects marketed openly versus insects whispered about

There is another world in which insects are handled very differently: the niche market of explicit insect foods. Here the marketing is almost aggressive in its honesty. Packaging proudly proclaims “cricket flour,” “mealworm snacks,” or “roasted grasshoppers.” The bugs are either visible—legs, wings, and all—or prominently named. The audience is small but clear: adventurous eaters, environmental enthusiasts, and people who like to be early adopters of strange things. In this lane, insects are not a secret ingredient; they are the entire point.

Restaurants sometimes dabble in this theater too: a pop-up with a tasting menu featuring ants, a bar that offers fried crickets as a novelty snack, a chef who appears in a magazine article explaining why we all need to get over our fear of bugs. The performance is built around

confrontation and transgression. You know exactly what you are doing when you order the dish. You might even take a picture to prove it. Whatever else is happening in the broader food system, this corner at least is honest about its crawly guests.

The dissonance arises when you set that openness next to the quieter, more bureaucratic appearance of insects in policy conversations. On the one hand, you have a transparent bag of grasshoppers or a clearly labeled cricket bar. On the other, you have global institutions discussing insects in the same breath as other “innovative protein sources” destined to be milled, processed, and blended. The first is candid and local; the second is abstract and scaled.

Between these two poles grows a third thing: the whisper. Not an advertised product, not a peer-reviewed report, but a suspicion that somewhere between policy talk and niche snacks, something more generalized is being prepared. In whispered form, insects are not for the adventurous few; they are for everyone, whether they consent or not. Here, the bug leaves the shelf and enters the imagination as a hidden component—more rumor than ingredient, but powerful precisely because its reality is so hard to nail down.

4.3 When a hypothetical becomes a rumor and then a certainty

The journey from “insects could be part of future diets” to “they are feeding you bugs right now” does not require any secret meetings. It requires a particular kind of information environment. First, a hypothetical is floated in an official context: technical documents say insects “could” supplement or replace other proteins in certain applications. Journalists condense that into articles with headlines about “eating bugs by 2050.” Social media users strip the timeframe and the conditional; all that remains is the phrase “you will eat the bugs.”

Once that phrase exists, it begins to collect additional elements. It is paired with other hypotheticals: “you will own nothing,” “you will live in a pod,” “you will be monitored.” The cluster feels coherent because all its parts speak to loss of control. Each new screenshot of a policy paper, conference panel, or startup pitch becomes another tile in a mosaic that was already sketched in outline. Soon, the question is no longer “Should we explore insects as part of future food security?” but “Why are they so obsessed with making us eat bugs?”

At this stage, the rumor does not need direct evidence of current practice to feel real. It has narrative momentum. A single photograph of insect-based dishes served at a conference can be read as symbolic: not “one item among many options,” but “a preview of your enforced menu.” A regulatory approval for an insect ingredient in a specific product category is interpreted as global adoption. The absence of clear communication from major brands becomes, itself, confirming: if nothing is happening, why are they so vague?

Finally, in certain circles, the story hardens into certainty. “They are already putting insects into your food” is repeated as a settled fact. When pressed for proof, believers may produce a

collage of headlines, novel-food approvals, and examples of niche products. The logical gaps between “might,” “can,” “some,” and “all” are bridged by distrust rather than data. After enough repetition, the line between symbol and ingredient blurs. Bugs are no longer just an efficient organism or an experimental snack; they are a stand-in for all the ways in which decisions about bodies and resources seem to be made elsewhere, with minimal consent.

The central irony is that this certainty arises in precisely the kind of environment where knowledge is most fragmented. The less people can see of the actual workings of food systems, the easier it is for the symbolic bug to crawl in and take up residence. Official voices insist that insects remain mostly hypothetical or niche. Suspicious voices insist they are already ubiquitous. In between lies the uncomfortable truth: in a long, opaque chain, most of us are not in a position to prove either side decisively. That is why insects make such potent symbols. They do not just raise the question “What are we eating?” They expose how rarely we can answer that question with confidence.

5. Three Scenarios: Explicit Bugs, Stealth Bugs, and Only Accidents

5.1 World A: insects are rare, labeled, and mostly novelty

In World A, the official story is roughly true. Insects show up where you would expect them to: in traditional cuisines, in small startup products aimed at adventurous eaters, in clearly labeled protein bars and snacks that brag about cricket flour or mealworms. A few high-profile restaurants experiment with tasting menus. Supermarkets in big cities have a “future foods” shelf with insect pasta and roasted grasshoppers in glass jars. Everything is quite visible if you go looking.

In this world, the mainstream supply of processed foods remains largely based on conventional sources: soy, peas, milk, eggs, and meat byproducts. Regulations do what they say on the tin. If insects are present, they appear under recognizable names in the ingredient list, and only in niche items. The average shopper can easily go through life without eating a single intentionally added bug, unless they choose to. Accidental insect fragments in flour, chocolate, and peanut butter are the same quiet background they have always been, tolerated as unavoidable rather than embraced as innovation.

The anxiety in World A does not vanish, but it has less to feed on. People who are worried about insects can check labels, avoid products that openly use them, and cook mostly from whole ingredients. Conspiracy theories still circulate, because the architecture of the food system is opaque enough to support them, but direct evidence for hidden insects remains thin. Arguments online revolve around whether insects *should* become more common, not whether

they already have. The dissonance between symbol and reality is high: bugs loom large in imagination, but their actual physical presence in everyday food is limited.

5.2 World B: insects seep quietly into blends and binders

World B is the one that many critics fear and some planners might consider efficient. In this scenario, insects begin as niche products and pilot projects, but over time their derivatives are adopted behind the scenes. Not in a dramatic, overnight way, but through a series of cost-driven decisions. A supplier offers a “sustainable protein concentrate” that happens to be insect-based, meeting all relevant safety standards and providing attractive functional qualities. It can be used in small percentages in existing formulations without altering taste or texture. It appears on paperwork under names few consumers recognize.

At the level of the label, World B looks almost identical to World A. You still see “protein blend,” “natural flavors,” or a list of protein sources that, on paper, may include an unfamiliar term. The explicit, novelty bug products are still there for the adventurous, but they are no longer the only place insects exist. A fraction of the protein in certain mass-market items now comes from insect farms, especially in product categories where margins are tight and ingredients are already heavily processed. The change is not trumpeted; it is folded into routine reformulations.

In this world, regulators may or may not require insect origin to be stated in a way the average person can parse. Even if they do, the terminology might be technical enough to slide past casual notice. An informed, determined label reader could piece together what is happening, but the majority simply see the same branded wrappers they have always seen. Physically, nothing catastrophic happens: nutrition is adequate, allergies are monitored, and most people never notice. Psychologically, however, the discovery—if and when it is made—would feel like a violation. The fear that “they are feeding us bugs without saying so” would no longer be merely symbolic. It would be, in some domains, true, even if the legal minimums for disclosure had been met.

5.3 World C: nothing much changed, but belief did

World C is perhaps the strangest, because it requires the least physical alteration and the most mental. In this scenario, the actual use of insects in mainstream food remains very close to World A: restricted to novelty products, traditional cuisines, experimental startups, and a handful of specialized ingredients. Regulators maintain a cautious stance; large brands decide that the reputational risk of stealth insects is not worth the potential savings. The supply chain has the *capacity* to introduce insect-derived proteins in more places, but for a mix of legal, economic, and cultural reasons, this never quite happens at scale.

What does change is the information environment. Memes, videos, and out-of-context screenshots spread faster than any technical correction can. A handful of articles about insect

approvals and futuristic diets are shared, mutated, and combined with other fears about control, digital surveillance, and climate policy. In online echo chambers, “you will eat the bugs” becomes a shorthand for a whole cluster of resentments. Visual images of conference buffets with insect dishes circulate as alleged proof that the future is already being imposed.

In World C, the belief that insects have infiltrated everything becomes more widespread than any actual insect protein. People scrutinize their snacks, see ambiguous phrases, and fill in the blanks with the story they have been told. Every reformulation is suspected. Every sustainability statement is read as a covert announcement of substitution. Brands that have never touched insect ingredients face boycotts based on associations they cannot easily refute. Trust erodes, not because of what is happening in factories, but because the gap between visible food and visible information has become too wide to bridge.

The cost of World C is subtle but real. People change their habits based on imagined threats, sometimes in healthier ways (more home cooking, fewer ultraprocessed foods), sometimes in ways driven by fear and fatigue. Institutions find that no amount of documentation persuades those who have already decided. The bug, as symbol, wins. It crawls not into the protein blend but into the shared imagination, where it does its work regardless of the actual menu.

6. The Schwabverse: Central Planners, Pods, and Protein Narratives

6.1 Why “you will eat the bugs” attached itself to one institution

In a world full of institutes, councils, consortiums, and task forces, it is curious that one particular organization became the gravitational center of the bug meme. Countless entities publish reports about climate, agriculture, and nutrition. Yet the phrase “you will eat the bugs” almost always orbits a single name and a single annual meeting in the snow.

Part of the reason is aesthetic. The imagery associated with certain global forums is almost too on the nose: private jets, alpine resorts, panels titled in corporate-moral language, photos of world leaders, CEOs, and celebrities in the same rooms. It looks like a stage set for central planning, even when the event is closer to a networking conference than a command center. To a suspicious eye, it resembles a place where decisions are made about people who are not invited.

Another reason is narrative convenience. Stories need characters. The idea of “systemic forces” quietly nudging diets and economies is abstract; the idea of “this one guy in a suit with a slogan” is concrete. When you attach a line like “you will eat the bugs” to a face and an institution, the diffuse worry about technocratic drift crystallizes. Suddenly there is a villain, or at least a protagonist, around whom disparate anxieties can be organized.

The final reason is timing. Discussions about insects, climate targets, and “future food” appeared in policy circles at roughly the same moment that many people felt their material lives becoming more precarious. Housing, wages, energy, and social stability were already under strain. Into that mix came visions of a managed future: smarter cities, green transitions, digital identities, dietary shifts. The bug became a shorthand for all of it. Even if the institution in question did not author the phrase, its brand was ready-made to carry it. The meme found a house with good acoustics.

6.2 Ownership, mobility, and diet as a single imagined package

“You will eat the bugs” rarely travels alone. It usually appears alongside two or three other future-tense promises, sometimes quoted from genuine promotional material, sometimes reconstructed in a kind of folk parody: you will own nothing, you will be tracked, you will live in a small space, you will not travel much. Together they form a package of imagined constraints on bodies, goods, and motion.

Ownership is the most obvious axis. The idea that private property, especially durable goods, might be replaced by subscriptions, rentals, and permanent indebtedness is not purely speculative; it is already visible in many sectors. When a slogan about “owning nothing” appears in a glossy article about 2030 lifestyles, it lands in a context where many people already feel that true ownership is slipping from their reach. Whether the line was meant as prediction, provocation, or clumsy optimism matters less than the way it echoes existing frustrations.

Mobility comes next. Limits on travel, whether for climate, health, or security reasons, have moved from the realm of science fiction into lived experience. Lockdowns, visa regimes, and the rising cost of transport have all contributed to the sense that ordinary movement is less guaranteed than it once was. When people see images of “fifteen-minute cities” framed as utopian, they can easily re-interpret them as gentle cages: comfortable, walkable, and quietly bounded.

Diet slots naturally into this bundle. What you eat is one of the few daily decisions that still feels personal. If a narrative suggests that your diet is being targeted by the same class of people who talk about your house and your car as “externalities” to be optimized, insects become more than insects. They become a sign that even the contents of your stomach are subject to planning. The idea that one set of institutions might, in a few decades, have a view on your mortgage, your commute, and your protein source is powerful, regardless of how accurate it is.

In this composite story, bugs are not isolated policy options. They are part of a totalizing imagined script: a world where comfort is maximized, volatility minimized, and individuality quietly traded for managed stability. Whether or not any real institution has the capacity to implement such a script is a separate question. The important point is that the pieces—housing

precarity, mobility limits, food-system proposals—are close enough together that the mind can connect them into a single line.

6.3 The psychological comfort of assuming someone, somewhere, is in charge

There is an odd consolation hidden inside even the darkest versions of this story. If you believe that central planners are successfully coordinating housing, transport, and diet at a planetary scale, then you believe that someone is in control. You may dislike their goals, resent their methods, and fear their designs, but you are spared a different kind of terror: the possibility that no one is steering.

A world run by a small group of technocrats is frightening, but it is coherent. There are names, locations, and meetings. Documents can be leaked, speeches parsed, strategies opposed. The villains are reachable, at least in theory. Protests have an address. In contrast, a world governed by a loose mesh of incentives, accidents, and conflicting interests is disorienting. Prices rise, options shrink, and diets change because a thousand decentralized pressures push that way, not because a plan says so. There is no table to flip, no mastermind to unmask.

When people graft insects onto the image of global planners, they are partly expressing anger. They are also reaching for a more structured reality than the one they inhabit. If “they” want you to eat bugs, then someone has read a report, made a proposal, and perhaps scheduled a rollout. The hardship is intentional, which means it might be reversed if the right levers are pulled. If, instead, insects enter the system only through a morass of supply shocks, venture capital trends, and regulatory drift, then there is no single lever, just a tangle.

This does not mean that central planners do not exist, or that their meetings have no consequences. It means that the psychological appeal of the Schwabverse exceeds whatever specific influence any one institution actually has. The more chaotic and opaque daily life feels, the more tempting it becomes to imagine that somewhere, behind the mountain resort and the polished stage, there is a coherent agenda that explains every discomfort—including the possibility that tomorrow’s protein might have legs.

In that sense, “you will eat the bugs” is less a statement about nutrition than a liturgy about agency. It compresses a whole cluster of doubts: about who decides, about whether consent matters, about how much of the future is writable from above. Whether or not the bugs ever truly arrive on the plate, the narrative that they were always part of the plan allows people to convert diffuse unease into a simple story with characters, motives, and an enemy. It is an imperfect story, but it is, for many, more bearable than randomness.

7. Grasshoppers You Can See vs. Powder You Cannot

7.1 Buying whole insects in a market with eyes open

Buying whole insects in a market is one of the few remaining food transactions where there is almost no informational overhead. You look into a bin or at a hanging bag and your brain does not have to decode anything. The object is the story. Grasshoppers are not pretending to be anything else. There is no mascot, no health claim, no photo of something more flattering than the product itself. The legs, wings, and blank compound eyes are all part of the offer: this is what you are being asked to eat.

In that situation, “trust” works differently. You are not trusting an invisible institution to tell you what the product really is; you are trusting that the visible thing in front of you has been handled reasonably, that it is fresh enough, and that the people selling it have some stake in their ongoing relationship with customers. The bet is concrete. If the bag is cloudy, if the smell is off, if the vendor looks embarrassed to answer questions, you can walk away. The risk is on a human scale and can be evaluated with senses and social cues.

There is also a kind of cultural triangulation at work. If your spouse or friends grew up eating the insects in question, their ordinariness in that context reassures you. They are not an experiment designed in a boardroom; they are somebody’s nostalgia. You may still hesitate, but you know that you are entering into a practice that pre-dates climate reports and venture capital. The grasshopper becomes an invitation into another culinary world, not a test of loyalty to a global narrative.

Most importantly, the decision is not hidden even from yourself. You know that you are about to eat an insect. If you go through with it, you do so with full internal consent. You might be curious, polite, or simply hungry, but you are not later surprised by the revelation that the crunchy bits were legs. That directness is rare in an era where many of our daily choices are mediated by language, branding, and design. Whole insects bypass all of that. They confront you, and if you accept, it is with your eyes open.

7.2 Processed foods, distance, and the erosion of direct trust

Processed foods invert that relationship. Here, distance is the default: distance in miles, in steps, and in understanding. The chicken nugget does not look like a bird; the protein shake does not look like any particular crop. At each stage, something is done to make the origin less obvious: grinding, blending, flavoring, shaping, coating. The result is something easy to eat and easy to forget the moment it is swallowed.

Trust, in this landscape, is routed through abstractions. You are asked to trust the brand, the regulatory stamp, the concept of “standards.” The visible cues are no longer biological but graphic: fonts, colors, slogans. Quality is suggested by the thickness of the cardboard and the

design of the logo, not by the gloss of a fish's eye or the smell of greens. When a company says "high protein" or "all natural," it is offering reassurance, but in a language that can be stretched without technically breaking.

Because so many hands and processes intervene between origin and mouth, the average person cannot reconstruct what happened. You can read the ingredient list, but as earlier sections noted, that list is itself a compressed, negotiated artifact. You cannot walk into the factory and follow the batch. You cannot interview every supplier. You might look up a strange term or two, but most people do not, and even if they did, they would find themselves facing PDFs and technical papers rather than the tidy narrative they were seeking.

Over time, this distance erodes direct trust. You may still eat the snack, but the act feels more like surrender than participation. You are not deciding what animal or plant to engage with; you are deciding which corporate story to believe less. When doubts arise—about insects, about fillers, about substitutions—they do not encounter a sturdy sense of "I know where this came from." They encounter a fog. In that fog, every suspicion feels more plausible because genuine knowledge is thin on the ground.

7.3 Why a clear bag of grasshoppers can feel less dystopian than a snack bar

This is why, paradoxically, a clear bag of dried grasshoppers in an ethnic supermarket can feel less dystopian than a "clean-label" snack bar in a health-food aisle. The grasshoppers may trigger disgust, but they do not trigger paranoia. They are what they are. If there is a dystopia here, it is older and simpler: poverty, hunger, the long human history of eating whatever the local ecology provides. There is no sense that someone elsewhere has scripted your menu. You and the insect meet each other honestly.

The snack bar, by contrast, carries the weight of its entire hidden system. Its friendliness is curated. The wrapper tells you it is on your side: mindful, balanced, optimized, maybe even planet-saving. Yet you cannot verify its claims without passing through several layers of professional mediation. If you later learn that some of its protein came from an unexpected source, you feel misled even if the label technically disclosed it. The distance between what you thought you were eating and what you were actually eating becomes a crack that suspicion pours into.

The bag of grasshoppers does not need a story. The bar requires one to make itself palatable. That difference in narrative load is what makes the first feel, in a strange way, more humane. It respects your ability to see, to decide, and even to refuse. The second subtly redirects your attention away from origin and toward lifestyle branding. It suggests that you are the kind of person who eats this sort of bar, but it is less forthcoming about precisely what that "sort" consists of.

In an information-dystopian sense, the bag of bugs is almost a relief. It demonstrates that not every food decision has been abstracted into policy, marketing, and hidden logistics. You can still, at least in some places, walk into a store and buy something whose identity is not a riddle. Whether you choose to eat it is another question. But the choice itself is clean. There is no need to speculate about committees or slide decks. You can count the grasshoppers. You know what you are swallowing, and what you are not.

8. Ethics, Theology, and the Question of What We Swallow Unseen

8.1 Locusts in scripture and the moral status of small creatures

When insects appear in Scripture, they occupy an ambiguous space. On one hand, locusts are instruments of judgment, darkening the sky and stripping fields bare. On the other, they show up as food. The dietary laws distinguish between insects that are permitted and those that are not, implying that at least some winged, hopping creatures are legitimate nourishment rather than contamination. Later, in the wilderness, John the Baptist survives on locusts and honey, a diet that sounds extreme to modern ears but would not have seemed outlandish in a region where such insects were seasonally abundant.

The presence of locusts in these texts does not settle twenty-first century food policy, but it does remind us that the idea of eating insects is neither unprecedented nor inherently degrading. The Bible never treats those who eat such creatures as less human. The moral weight in the stories falls not on the size of the animal but on the posture of the eater: humility, repentance, dependence on God in sparse circumstances. In this frame, the difference between a lamb and a locust is biological and cultural, not spiritual.

That raises a broader question about the moral status of small creatures. Traditions that emphasize human dominion over creation can be tempted to treat insects as pure resource or pure nuisance. Traditions that emphasize stewardship insist that even the least significant life forms exist within a larger order that deserves respect. Killing an insect for food may not carry the drama of slaughtering cattle, but it is still an act of taking life. Acknowledging that does not mean equating grasshoppers with people; it means resisting the habit of thinking that whatever is tiny is morally invisible.

From a theological perspective, the question is not whether insects are “worthy” of being eaten. It is whether the human heart engaged in eating them is capable of gratitude instead of contempt. The same God who is said to notice the fall of a sparrow is, presumably, not baffled by the death of a cricket. Insects, like larger animals, are part of a created ecology that humans depend on and disrupt. That context matters more than any modern squeamishness about exoskeletons.

8.2 Stewardship, consent, and the difference between gift and trick

Food in biblical language is often framed as gift. “Give us this day our daily bread” is a request that presumes an open hand: what sustains life is something received, not seized. Stewardship extends that logic to the human side: we are called to handle what we have been given in ways that align with care, justice, and honesty. In that light, using insects as food can be understood as one more form of stewarding creation. If a species can be farmed with low environmental cost and high nutritional value, there is nothing inherently obscene about harvesting it.

The ethical tension arises elsewhere: in the manner of offering and receiving. A gift that is disguised starts to look like a trick. If insects are presented plainly—named on labels, visible in dishes, explained in context—then those who accept them know what they are agreeing to. Their consent is real, even if they had to overcome initial disgust. If, however, insects enter long supply chains in ways that most eaters cannot see or reasonably discern, consent becomes muddled. The issue is less that a cricket molecule crossed a boundary, and more that the human being at the end of the chain was never invited into the decision.

This distinction matters theologically because deception, even when technically legal, undermines the trust required for any community to function. A person who discovers that they have been routinely eating something they would have refused if informed is likely to feel betrayed. The betrayal is not simply about the bug; it is about being treated as an object to be managed rather than a subject capable of deciding. In Christian terms, this touches on the difference between shepherding and manipulating. One cares for the flock in ways they can recognize; the other treats them as a problem to be optimized.

There is an uneasy contrast here with the central Christian ritual of eating and drinking: the shared table at which bread and wine are named directly, blessed openly, and given with an explanation of their meaning. Whatever else one believes about that meal, its transparency is radical. Nothing is hidden. The worshipper knows what is being received and why. Opposed to that is a modern landscape in which many daily meals are structured around obscurity. The theological problem is not that the ingredients are “low,” but that the people consuming them are kept low in knowledge.

8.3 Pride, humility, and the temptation to despise “low” foods while accepting “high” ignorance

One of the stranger features of contemporary food culture is the double standard between what is considered socially acceptable to despise and what is quietly tolerated. Many people who recoil at the idea of eating insects will routinely ingest highly processed products whose origins and composition they barely understand. The “low” food is rejected with loud disgust; the “high-ignorance” food is accepted with a shrug.

At heart, this is a question about pride and humility. To call a food “gross” is not merely to report a sensation; it is often to position oneself above those who eat it. The history of cuisine is full of “peasant foods” later discovered to be nutritionally sound, creative responses to scarcity, or even delicacies in disguise. Insects in many cultures play that role. To dismiss them out of hand can become a way of signaling class and identity: “we” are the kind of people who eat clean, abstracted, sanitized products, not the kind who come face to face with small creatures on a plate.

Yet the same person who sneers at a bowl of fried grasshoppers may accept without protest a “premium” bar whose ingredient list is a maze of isolates and proprietary blends. The humility required to eat what is obviously humble is often greater than the humility required to trust a brand. It is easier, psychologically, to feel in control when the uncomfortable parts of reality are hidden. Theologically, that may be backwards. A tradition that honors the poor, the small, and the overlooked has little reason to mock foods that are closer to the ground and more exposed to view, and much reason to question systems that normalize cultivated ignorance.

This does not mean everyone is obliged to add insects to their diet as a spiritual exercise. Conscience, culture, and genuine physical reactions all matter. But it does suggest that the tone in which we refuse certain foods is not ethically neutral. To say “I cannot get past my revulsion” is one thing; to say “only degraded people would eat that” is another. The first is honest about weakness; the second turns weakness into a weapon.

In the context of unknown protein, this contrast becomes sharper. When we eagerly consume products that ask us to suspend curiosity, and angrily reject foods that are honest about their lowliness, we reveal something about our formation. We may be less concerned with purity than with appearances. A clear bag of grasshoppers forces us to look at what sustains us and decide. A glossy wrapper invites us to avoid that confrontation altogether. The temptation is to side with the wrapper and call it sophistication.

Humility, in this arena, would look like a willingness to align our outrage with reality. If we are disturbed by the thought of being tricked into eating bugs, we should be at least as disturbed by the broader habit of being tricked into eating anything at all without real understanding. If we feel superior to those who eat “low” foods, we might ask whether our own ready acceptance of “high-ignorance” foods is actually a mark of progress or simply a more comfortable form of dependence. The question of insects, in the end, is not only about what goes into the stomach. It is about whether we prefer visible humility to invisible control, both on the plate and in the heart.

9. Coping Strategies in the Age of Unknown Protein

9.1 Reading labels like a lawyer and still not being sure

One obvious response to the fog is to stare harder into it. People start reading labels the way attorneys read contracts: not for poetry, but for loopholes. The shopping trip becomes a quasi-legal exercise in spotting red flags. “Natural flavors” gets side-eyed. “Protein blend” is silently translated as “we can change this whenever we like.” Long, unpronounceable terms get Googled in the aisle. Some shoppers pick up products, read, frown, and put them back in a rhythm that looks more like document review than grocery buying.

This diligence is not pointless. There are things that labels really do reveal: the presence of known allergens, certain additives, specific animal products that matter for religious or ethical reasons. Becoming literate in ingredient lists can protect you from the most obvious incompatibilities. Over time, patterns emerge. You learn which brands have a habit of using every cheap filler available, and which ones at least make an effort at intelligible recipes. You notice when a familiar product suddenly grows a new line of text, like a legal clause slipped into a contract revision.

But even the most careful reader eventually bumps into the structural limit: the label is a summary, not a confession. It answers only the questions the law knows how to ask. A phrase may be technically informative and practically opaque at the same time. You can know that “flavoring” is derived from a biological source without knowing which species. You can know that a protein is “plant-based” and still have no idea about the solvents, processing steps, and intermediate materials that shaped it on its way to your mouth.

So reading like a lawyer does not dispel the unknown protein fog; it thickens it in a more detailed way. You move from vague suspicion to specific uncertainties. That can be progress if it leads to concrete choices: deciding to avoid certain categories, to favor shorter lists, to privilege foods whose ingredients you could theoretically obtain yourself. The danger is that label reading becomes a form of self-torment, an attempt to extract a level of certainty that the system was never designed to give. At some point, the question is not “Can I know everything?” but “Have I learned enough to make a decision I can live with?”

9.2 Shortening the chain: whole foods, local suppliers, small lies instead of big ones

Another way to cope is not to interrogate the fog more aggressively, but to spend less of your life inside it. Shortening the chain does not solve everything, but it changes the geometry of trust. Buying whole foods—vegetables, fruits, grains, legumes, recognizable cuts of meat—limits the space in which unknown protein can hide. An apple can still be sprayed, a chicken can still be raised in conditions you would not endorse, but there are fewer places for biological origin to be disguised. You can stand in a kitchen and see the raw thing transform into dinner.

Local suppliers fit into this strategy not because they are inherently virtuous, but because they are more exposed. A farmer at a market, a butcher who knows the names of their sources, a small mill that grinds grain in your region—these people can still disappoint you, but their lies have to be smaller. If they misrepresent what they sell, the feedback loops are short and personal. You can ask them questions, watch their reactions, and notice whether their story is consistent over time. “Small lies instead of big ones” is not a moral ideal, but it is a step away from systems where any error or deception can scale across millions of units before anyone notices.

Gardens, community-supported agriculture, co-ops, and home cooking all pull in the same direction. They do not guarantee purity; they simply re-align your diet toward inputs that must show their faces. Insect fragments may still appear—real, unintentional ones, courtesy of the natural world—but the chances of being quietly fed milled insect protein in a “blend” shrink. You trade some convenience for a higher ratio of visible, nameable food.

Of course, this strategy has limits and privileges. Not everyone has access to land, markets, or time. Some are constrained by income, geography, or physical ability. The point is not to erect a new standard of righteousness that looks suspiciously like lifestyle branding. It is to acknowledge that every step you can take to bring your food decisions closer to observable reality is a small act of resistance against a system optimized for opacity. When you cannot avoid long chains entirely, you can at least be conscious about when you are in them, and what parts of your diet you reserve for shorter ones.

9.3 Psychological posture: between apathy, obsession, and dark humor

Beyond labels and sourcing, there is the harder question of how to live internally with uncertainty. One temptation is apathy: to shrug, mutter “everything’s poisoned anyway,” and stop thinking. This posture has a certain bleak efficiency. If nothing you do matters, you are spared the work of discernment. But apathy corrodes more than anxiety does. It does not just flatten concern about insects; it flattens concern about anything that cannot be fixed immediately. Over time, it trains you to treat your body and mind as disposable, which is convenient for systems that profit from low resistance.

The opposite temptation is obsession. In this stance, every snack becomes a battlefield, every news article a clue, every ambiguous phrase a potential smoking gun. The mind arranges screenshots, ingredient lists, and policy quotes into elaborate mental corkboards. Some of the connections may be insightful; others spiral into pattern-seeking for its own sake. The problem with obsession is not that it takes the issue too seriously, but that it silently shifts the center of gravity of your life. Unknown protein begins to occupy the part of the mind that should be reserved for larger things: relationships, work, prayer, beauty, grief.

Between these two extremes lies a narrower path that often has to be walked with a bit of dark humor. Humor, in this context, is not denial. It is a way of acknowledging the absurdity of the situation—that in a technologically advanced civilization, you cannot say with full confidence what is in your own lunch—without either collapsing or raging constantly. It allows you to say, “Yes, this is ridiculous,” while you read the label, buy the whole chicken instead of the mystery nugget, and then get on with your day.

A sane posture might look like this: you learn enough to avoid the most egregious unknowns; you choose simpler foods when you can; you build a few trusted relationships in your food network; and then you consciously refuse to let the remaining uncertainty colonize your entire imagination. You keep a gentle skepticism toward marketing, a wary respect for the power of supply chains, and a sense of proportion about how much of your finite energy belongs here.

For some, this posture will also include a theological dimension: entrusting the part you cannot control to a God who has watched humans eat far worse in far darker times, and who does not require perfect dietary information as a condition of care. For others, it will be a secular act of boundary-setting: deciding that while the system may be opaque, your whole inner life does not need to be. Either way, the goal is to live alert without living consumed—to know that unknown protein is a real issue, and also to know that your humanity is not defined solely by what you cannot see in the blend.

10. If They Are Feeding Us Bugs: What Changes, What Does Not

10.1 Bodily consequences: nutrition, allergy, and the mundane

Start with the least cinematic part of the scenario: what happens to actual bodies. If insect protein has seeped into the food system in ways people do not fully realize, the everyday consequences are likely to be more mundane than apocalyptic. Many insects are nutritionally competent: they provide protein, fat, micronutrients, and calories in forms the human digestive system can handle. For a large number of people, eating a modest amount of insect-derived protein—especially if it is milled, cooked, and blended—would not produce any obvious change in how they feel from day to day.

There are, however, edges where biology bites back. Insects share certain proteins with crustaceans; people who are allergic to shrimp or crab might find that hidden insect components trigger similar reactions. Even if regulators technically require disclosures, vague terminology or unfamiliar Latin names could make it difficult for vulnerable individuals to recognize the risk. A rash here, a tightness in the chest there, a mysterious stomach upset that comes and goes: these are not the hallmarks of a grand dystopia, but they matter intensely to

the person living through them. The harm is not world-ending; it is personal, chronic, and often misdiagnosed.

There is also the question of cumulative exposure. A little insect protein in one product may be harmless; a scattering of it across many categories could, over years, shift baselines in ways no one bothers to measure. Not necessarily for the worse—some deficiencies might even improve—but the point is that bodies would be adapting to an unannounced change. When people later discover that adaptation, the sense of violation may outweigh any measurable physiological effect. The line crossed is not “you made me sick” but “you made me change without telling me.”

At the same time, many things would not change. People would still suffer more from sugar, sedentary life, and loneliness than from the provenance of their protein. Hospital wards would not suddenly fill with patients labeled “bug exposure.” Life expectancy curves would barely twitch. The quiet cruelty of the scenario lies precisely in this ordinariness. A person might swallow insect-derived nutrients for years without ever being sure whether they did, while the real damage accrues in the domain of trust rather than tissue.

10.2 Social consequences: class, stigma, and who eats what without knowing

If hidden insects enter the food system, they will not enter evenly. No substitution ever does. Processed foods aimed at cost-sensitive markets—school lunches, institutional catering, low-priced snacks, bulk mixes—would be the likeliest testing grounds. The logic is simple: small per-unit savings matter most where margins are thinnest and buyers are least able to pay for alternatives. In that pattern, one can already see the familiar outline of class stratification.

Those with money, time, and social capital are more likely to eat from shorter chains: fresh ingredients, boutique brands that trade on transparency, restaurants that flaunt their sourcing. If they encounter insects, it may be in fashionable, self-aware ways: a tasting menu, a carefully marketed “sustainable protein” bar, a travel story about trying fried grasshoppers. For everyone else, the encounter—if it happens—is more likely to be anonymous. Bugs arrive not as a choice but as a quiet component of whatever is cheapest, available, and aggressively branded as “good value.”

Stigma would follow an uneven path. Even if most people cannot verify who is eating what, they can imagine it. The idea that “the poor are being fed bugs” slots neatly into existing narratives about disposable populations. Whether or not it is factually accurate in any one case, the suspicion reinforces a sense that dignity and informed consent are optional at the bottom of the hierarchy. Meanwhile, the wealthy might congratulate themselves on “choosing” insects as part of an enlightened, climate-conscious cuisine, while also insisting on clarity and control in ways others are denied.

There is also the internal stigma within communities. Imagine discovering that a food you have eaten for years contains something you would have rejected if you had known. The embarrassment can easily curdle into shame: “I was naive; I was duped.” People may reassert control by mocking others who still eat the suspect products, or by policing diets in ways that fracture families and social groups. The irony is that actual health effects may be modest, but the symbolic ones—who eats “real food,” who eats “trash,” who is “in the know”—become sharper.

Yet certain social realities would remain untouched. People would still gather around tables, share meals, and build their identities partly through what they refuse or accept. Traditions would persist alongside substitutions. Even in a bug-inflected food system, there would be households and communities for whom the main drama is still whether there is enough on the plate, not whether it has wings buried in the ingredient list. The new layer of class coding would sit atop older dynamics, intensifying some, leaving others unchanged.

10.3 Spiritual consequences: trust, betrayal, and the habit of suspicion

The deepest changes in this scenario may not appear in lab results or purchase data, but in the interior life. Food sits close to the core of trust. From infancy onward, being fed is one of the first experiences of dependence on others. If adults come to believe—or discover—that the simplest daily act of eating has been quietly altered without their knowledge, it can mark that trust in ways no apology erases quickly. The content of the betrayal is small; the form is large.

One spiritual consequence is a hardening of suspicion. A person who feels tricked about their food will be less inclined to take anything else at face value: official statements, sermons, even the kindness of neighbors. The world tilts toward paranoia, not because the mind has suddenly gone irrational, but because it is rational to update one’s expectations when secrecy is rewarded. In such a climate, good faith becomes harder to maintain. Every assurance sounds like spin. Every attempt at transparency is examined for the angle it must be hiding.

Another consequence is the erosion of gratitude. Gratitude for food is easier when you can point to its sources: the soil, the farmer, the cook, the God who made harvest possible. When the origins recede into opaque supply chains and undisclosed substitutions, thanksgiving starts to feel naive. “Bless this food” begins to sound like “bless this mystery substance whose true nature we are not trusted with.” Some will continue to pray the words, but with a hollow space underneath, a sense that they are giving thanks for something they do not really know.

For those shaped by religious ethics that place a high value on truth-telling, the sense of being deceived about diet can also provoke a sharper moral response. It is not just, “You fed me insects,” but “You decided, without me, what my body would become.” That decision has an almost liturgical character: a change in practice enacted by authorities, justified by high

principles, but experienced at the granular level of daily bread. The injury is not so much to the stomach as to the sense of being treated as a person capable of consent.

At the same time, not everything in the spiritual realm would break. People have lived, and still live, under far worse material deprivations and manipulations. Faith has survived famines, adulterated flour, and much more brutal forms of exploitation. The resilience of conscience, prayer, and community is not so fragile that a cricket molecule can undo it. But the habit of suspicion, once installed, is hard to evict. If they are feeding us bugs, the challenge for the inner life is not merely to identify the deception, but to resist letting that discovery turn every relationship into a potential ambush.

Living in that tension requires a delicate balance: refusing to romanticize systems that do not deserve it, while also refusing to let justified anger metastasize into a total inability to trust anyone or anything. In a world where unknown protein is real, the spiritual task is to keep sight of the difference between vigilance and corrosive cynicism, between naming betrayal and making it the only story.

11. If They Are Not Feeding Us Bugs: The Dystopia Was Information All Along

11.1 The cost of living in permanent maybe

Suppose, after all the speculation and suspicion, it turns out that the mainstream food system has barely touched insect protein at all. Pilot projects remained pilots, regulations stayed cautious, big brands decided the risk was not worth it. The snacks and meals you have been eating are still built from the same soy, corn, wheat, cows, and chickens as before. In that case, the harm did not come from what was on the plate. It came from the fact that you could never quite be sure.

Living in a state of permanent maybe is not a neutral condition. It slowly rewires the nervous system. Every bite becomes a small act of doubt: “What if...?” The question is rarely loud enough to stop you from eating, but it is often loud enough to stain the moment. Suspicion becomes a background hum that shares space with all the other low-grade anxieties of contemporary life. It does not explode; it accumulates.

Over time, this uncertainty does two contradictory things. On some days, it makes you hypervigilant: you read articles, compare labels, share posts, argue with strangers online about what is “really” happening. On other days, it drives you into numbness: you push the thought away and tell yourself there’s no point worrying. The mind oscillates between these poles, rarely landing on the steady “I know enough to act and then let go.” Even if no insect ever crossed your lips, the architecture of uncertainty has already eaten something: your ability to inhabit ordinary acts without a thin film of doubt.

There is also a social cost. Permanent maybe erodes shared reality. If one person believes bugs are everywhere and another believes that's pure fantasy, but neither can produce decisive evidence either way, conversation stalls in mutual suspicion. Each side can accuse the other of naivety or paranoia, but both are, in a sense, reacting to the same structural ambiguity. The dystopia is not that "they" made everyone eat insects. It is that the conditions in which no one can rule it out have become normal.

11.2 How much damage a rumor can do without being true

Rumors are often judged by their factual accuracy, but their real power lies in what they enable, justify, or prevent. A rumor need not be true to do work. "They are feeding you bugs" can reshape behavior, trust, and policy even if no large-scale insect substitution has occurred. People might stop buying certain products based purely on association, not evidence. Companies may divert resources into managing perception rather than improving substance. Regulators may spend time and energy addressing fears that do not correspond to current practice, while other, less meme-able issues go unexamined.

At the personal level, rumors can fracture relationships. Families split over diet choices; friends dismiss each other as gullible or conspiratorial; communities sort themselves by narrative allegiance. The bug rumor becomes a litmus test not only for what you think about food, but for what you think about authority, media, and expertise. It can turn a supermarket aisle into a proxy battleground for much larger grievances.

At the institutional level, even false rumors leave residue. Once an organization has been widely accused of plotting to make people eat insects, any future conversation it tries to have about protein, climate, or agriculture is received through that filter. Trust, once lost, is not restored by a press release or a fact-check. The absence of evidence becomes suspicious in itself: "Of course they'd deny it." The rumor hardens into a kind of folklore, passed along not because it has been verified, but because it fits how people already feel about power.

In that sense, the question "Are they feeding us bugs?" is almost secondary. The rumor's deeper function is to express an intuition: that decisions are being made elsewhere, that ordinary people are not fully informed, that "progress" may come at costs they do not get to vote on. Even if the specific bug story is wrong, it has done the work of articulating and amplifying that intuition. The damage is that attention and energy are captured by a symbol while the underlying conditions that made the symbol plausible remain largely untouched.

11.3 What the bug question reveals about our whole information ecology

Whether the answer is yes, no, or "not really but maybe someday," the bug question itself is diagnostic. It tells us something about the environment in which knowledge, belief, and suspicion now circulate. We live in a world where technical information is abundant but

unevenly accessible, where institutions are both more visible and less trusted than before, and where narratives spread faster than corrections. In this landscape, an ordinary person's ability to form grounded judgments about complex systems is constantly being stretched.

The fact that "Are there insects in my food?" can plausibly remain unresolved for most people is part of a larger pattern. Similar questions hover over data collection, financial systems, medical decisions, and algorithmic curation. "What are they doing with my information?" "What is really in this policy?" "What is this black-box model optimizing for?" These questions, like the bug question, often lack satisfying, concrete answers at the scale of individual experience. People are left stitching together bits of evidence, anecdotes, and vibes into workable mental maps.

In that sense, unknown protein is just one manifestation of unknown everything. The same forces that make it hard to see into supply chains make it hard to see into code, contracts, and corridors of power. The rumor about bugs is tethered to real opacity. It is easier to mock the rumor than to redesign the systems that sustain the conditions for it. But if we only ever reassure, "No, that particular thing is not happening," without addressing why so many people found it believable, we have not learned much.

The bug question reveals how thin the line is between legitimate critical thinking and corrosive distrust. In a healthy information ecology, a worrying possibility could be investigated, answered, and either acted on or set aside. In ours, even straightforward questions tend to get absorbed into broader identity battles: whose sources you trust becomes who you are. The content of the claim matters less than the camp it places you in.

If they are not feeding us bugs, the invitation is not to relax into smugness, but to ask why so many of us found that idea emotionally true even if it turns out to be factually false. Perhaps it felt like a concentrated image of everything else we sense but cannot name: distance, abstraction, being acted upon. The real dystopia, in that case, is an information environment where ordinary people are systematically positioned to suspect, but rarely empowered to know.

12. Conclusion: Unknowns, Dinner, and the Freedom to Laugh Anyway

12.1 What insects, real or imagined, taught us about food and trust

By the time we reach the end of this line of thought, the insects themselves have become almost secondary. Whether they are crawling visibly in a frying pan, ground invisibly into a protein blend, or existing only in rumor, they have done their job as teachers. They have traced, in miniature, the outlines of a much bigger problem: the distance between what we consume and what we can actually know about it. A grasshopper on a plate is simple. A "high-protein snack" with a global pedigree is not.

Real insects, in traditional cuisines and transparent packaging, remind us that disgust and dignity do not always agree. A food can be materially humble and morally straightforward. If you are going to eat a creature, there is a certain honesty in meeting its shape and name face to face. Imagined insects, discussed in policy forums and meme threads, reveal how quickly symbols can outrun facts when people no longer trust the narratives that surround their daily lives. The same bug that is a snack in one context becomes a proxy for technocratic control in another.

Along the way, the question “Are they feeding us bugs?” has forced us to ask better ones. How many steps are there between the source of our food and our mouths? At which points do decisions get made that we never hear about? How do labeling practices, regulatory compromises, and marketing language shape what we believe we are eating? And underneath those, a more elemental question: who, if anyone, do we actually trust to tell us the truth about our own bodies?

In that sense, insects have functioned as an x-ray dye in the bloodstream of the food system. They have illuminated weak spots in transparency, fault lines in class, and fractures in the relationship between citizens and institutions. Whether the dye corresponds to a real mass of insect protein or just to the outline of a rumor matters, but it is not the only thing that matters. The very plausibility of the question has already told us something about the world we inhabit.

12.2 Modest proposals for a less opaque plate

There is always the temptation, at the end of an analysis like this, to propose something grand and improbable: a total redesign of global supply chains, a perfectly traceable blockchain for every grain of flour, a new age of radical honesty in corporate communication. It is safer, and more realistic, to stay modest. The aim is not purity but less opacity, not omniscience but fewer blind spots.

On the personal side, the proposals are deceptively simple. Buy more things whose identity you can see. Favor ingredients with names you could sketch or point to in a field. Learn a handful of basic dishes that start from whole foods rather than from powders and blends. None of this guarantees virtue, but it reduces the number of places where unknown protein can hide and shifts at least some of your diet back into a realm where your senses and common sense are competent tools.

On the communal side, support and, when possible, build shorter chains. That might mean farmers’ markets, co-ops, community-supported agriculture, small butchers and bakers who are close enough to speak for themselves. These places are not automatically holy, but their lies and mistakes are smaller and easier to detect. A local mill that cheats will run out of customers; a

distant conglomerate can misstep for a long time before any individual feels able to hold it accountable.

On the institutional side, some reforms are low-hanging fruit. Ingredient labeling could be moved a little closer to plain language, especially for novel sources. Regulators could insist that certain umbrella phrases be unpacked into specifics when new biological origins are involved. Public communication about pilot projects, approvals, and policy directions could be designed to admit uncertainty and trade-offs without hiding behind euphemism. None of this would stop bad actors entirely, but it would raise the baseline clarity so that every anxious question does not immediately fall off a cliff into maybe.

These proposals are intentionally small enough to be boring. The fantasy that there is a single, dramatic lever that will fix the relationship between food and trust is itself part of the problem. Trust is rebuilt the same way it was eroded: incrementally, in a thousand interactions between buyers and sellers, citizens and institutions, families and their own habits. A less opaque plate is not spotless. It is simply one where the average eater has a fighting chance of understanding, in broad terms, what they are swallowing.

12.3 Final reflections on living with partial knowledge without giving up agency

In the end, unknown protein is just one instance of a much larger human condition: we never know as much as we wish we did about the systems that shape our lives. Perfect information is not on the menu. The crucial question is what we do with that realization. We can yield to apathy, deciding that everything is equally compromised, so there is no point trying. We can indulge in obsession, letting a single issue colonize all our attention. Or we can try to occupy a narrower, more uncomfortable middle ground.

That middle ground looks like this: you accept that there will always be gaps in your knowledge, and you commit to doing what you reasonably can within your limits. You learn enough to make informed choices where they matter most. You adjust your habits to reduce your dependence on the most opaque structures. You stay alert to patterns of manipulation without letting them swallow your capacity for joy. You build pockets of trust where you can, even if they are small, and you reserve the right to laugh, because humor is one of the few tools that can puncture both propaganda and paranoia at the same time.

For people who frame their lives theologically, this posture will inevitably involve some form of handing over. You acknowledge that you are not sovereign over every molecule in your diet and that this has always been true, long before corporate supply chains existed. You seek to be faithful in what you can see and honest about what you cannot, trusting that divine care does not depend on perfect consumer knowledge. For those who do not share that framework, a

similar humility is still available: an admission that being human has always meant acting under uncertainty, and that dignity consists not in control but in how we respond.

The bug question, pushed to its limits, leaves us with a simple, hard-won freedom. You are allowed to care about what is in your food without turning that concern into a total worldview. You are allowed to demand clearer speech from institutions without imagining that clarity will ever be complete. You are allowed to eat the grasshopper in full awareness, or to decline it, or to eat the snack bar while knowing that some level of mystery remains. The point is not to eliminate unknowns, but to refuse to be either their victim or their willing accomplice.

If they are feeding us bugs, much of this still applies. If they are not, most of it does as well. The real task is to become the kind of person who can inhabit either possibility without surrendering to despair: someone who shops and cooks and prays and jokes in a world where certainty is rare, but where agency, rightly understood, is still very much on the table.

Epilogue: Are There Bugs in the AI?

If unknown protein is what you swallow, unknown text is what you click “Send” into. The same civilization that turned food into long, opaque supply chains has done something similar with language and knowledge. Large models sit at the end of chains made of crawled pages, digitized books, message boards, corporate documents, and training tricks that sound reassuringly abstract: “pretraining,” “fine-tuning,” “alignment.” By the time a sentence reaches you as an answer, it has been milled, blended, filtered, and extruded through mathematics. You are seeing the snack bar, not the field.

So the question “Are there bugs in the AI?” is not just a programmer’s joke. It is a cousin of “Are there insects in my food?” It asks, in a different register, what has crawled into the system on the way from the wild to your screen. Some bugs are literal: mis-specified loss functions, edge cases in tokenization, numerical instabilities. Those are the software kind, the ones engineers hunt with test suites and patches. But there are softer bugs as well: rumor as fact, spin as neutral description, carefully crafted talking points masquerading as spontaneous truth. If such things live in the training data, they do not cease to exist just because they have been blended into a trillion-parameter paste.

Like protein isolates, most of the training corpus is probably perfectly ordinary. News, textbooks, manuals, open-source code, blogs, the endless middle of the internet. A great bulk of it is boring, which is precisely what makes it useful: lots of mundane patterns to learn from. But here and there the mix contains its own equivalent of insects-as-symbol—conspiracy threads, corporate self-congratulation, policy papers written in that peculiar dialect where verbs never

quite admit responsibility. When the AI later strings together a fluent answer, it can be hard to tell which atoms came from where.

Our relationship to these systems looks eerily like our relationship to the modern plate. We are given a short ingredient list for the model: “trained on a mixture of licensed data, data created by human trainers, and publicly available data.” This is the “natural flavors” of AI. It is not false, but it is coarse. It does not tell you which outlets, which books, which forums, or which hidden assumptions about what counts as a good answer were baked into the loss function. You could read every public white paper and still find yourself in the same position as the label-reading shopper: more informed than you were, not nearly as informed as you’d like.

The temptation to paranoia is similar. “Are there bugs in the AI?” can morph, if you let it, into “They are using AI to feed me bugs of thought without my consent.” You can imagine centralized scriptwriters using models as amplifiers, embedding preferred narratives in a form that looks neutral and rational. Some of that fear has roots in reality; powerful tools attract ambitious users. But as with food, the deeper problem may be less a single smoking gun and more a diffuse structure: opaque pipelines, vague disclosures, long chains of influence where no one actor holds the entire picture.

There is, too, the class dimension. Not everyone will interact with these systems in the same way. Some will use them as occasional tools: a summary here, a translation there, a draft to edit and distrust on sight. Others will rely on them heavily for news, explanation, even moral vocabulary. The equivalent of “who eats the unknown protein without knowing” becomes “who lets the AI be their primary teacher without asking what the teacher has been reading.” Bugs in the AI, if they exist, will not be distributed evenly. Neither will the skills needed to notice them.

Yet here as in the food world, the most important line is not between perfect purity and total contamination, but between honesty and trick. A model that admits uncertainty, shows its working when it can, and foregrounds its limits may still carry training-set bugs, but it at least invites the user into a more adult relationship. A model that presents itself as a smooth oracle—effortless, placeless, unmarked—is closer to the glossy bar that wants you to trust its branding more than its biography. The ethical fault is not that imperfections exist. It is that they are treated as proprietary secrets rather than shared constraints.

There is a small, practical symmetry we can choose. In the same way we can shorten food chains where possible, we can shorten reasoning chains. Instead of asking an AI to be a replacement for thought, we can treat it as one more ingredient in a meal we are still cooking ourselves. We can ask it for alternatives, not decrees; for possibilities, not final verdicts. We can cross-check it against sources we know, against communities we trust, against our own

conscience. In that posture, bugs in the AI become less catastrophic. They are simply one more thing to filter.

And there is room for humor, which is not trivial here. The ability to joke about bugs in the AI is a sign that we have not fully surrendered either to apathy or to dread. We can acknowledge the absurdity of relying on systems whose internal workings we cannot personally audit, while still using them. We can turn the question around: if there are bugs in the AI, there were bugs in the civilization that trained it—unknown proteins of propaganda, wishful thinking, and carefully curated ignorance. At least now we have a mirror that makes those patterns more visible, if we care to look.

In the end, the epilogue folds back into the main thesis. Whether the topic is food or language, protein or prediction, we are living at the far end of chains we do not fully control. That has always been true to some extent; it is simply more obvious now. The task is not to find a place untouched by unknowns. It is to cultivate habits—of scrutiny, of humility, of shared checking—that let us live with unknowns without being quietly reshaped by them.

So: are there bugs in the AI? Almost certainly, in every sense of the word. The more important question is what we do with that knowledge. If we react by demanding impossible purity, we will be disappointed. If we react by shrugging and treating every output as equally arbitrary, we will be misled. Somewhere between those two lies a more workmanlike response: take what is useful, test what is important, laugh at what is ridiculous, and remember that your agency does not depend on having a perfectly clean plate or a perfectly clean model. It depends on not swallowing everything unseen.

References

1. Van Huis, A., Van Itterbeeck, J., Klunder, H., et al. (2013). *Edible Insects: Future Prospects for Food and Feed Security*. FAO Forestry Paper 171, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. [FAOHome+1](#)
2. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. (2013–2025). *Edible insects – Insects for food and feed*. FAO programme overview and information portal. [FAOHome](#)
3. Govorushko, S. (2019). Global status of insects as food and feed source: A review. *Trends in Food Science & Technology*, 91, 436–445. [ScienceDirect](#)
4. Van Huis, A. (2021). How many people on our planet eat insects: 2 billion? *Journal of Insects as Food and Feed*, 7(5), 835–842. [eDepot+1](#)
5. Lange, K. W., & Nakamura, Y. (2021). Edible insects as future food: Chances and challenges. *Nutrition and Healthy Aging*, 6(4), 209–222. [ScienceDirect](#)
6. Meyer-Rochow, V. B., et al. (2022). Editorial: Insects as food and feed. *Frontiers in Nutrition*, 9, 873885. [PMC](#)
7. European Commission / European Food Safety Authority. (2021–2024). *Insect novel food authorisations in the EU* (including *Tenebrio molitor*, *Locusta migratoria*, *Acheta domesticus*). EFSA novel food opinions and Commission Implementing Regulations. [ipiff.org+3Food Safety+3European Food Safety Authority+3](#)
8. Safefood360. (2022). Novel Food Regulation: EFSA Versus FDA. Background article on regulatory frameworks for new food ingredients. [Safefood 360°](#)
9. U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA). (2018–2024). *Food Defect Levels Handbook* and related “Filth and Extraneous Materials” guidance: natural or unavoidable insect fragments in foods that present no health hazard. [gigasheet.com+4U.S. Food and Drug Administration+4California Department of Public Health+4](#)
10. Hubert, A. (2021). Why we need to give insects the role they deserve in our food systems. *World Economic Forum* (online article). [World Economic Forum](#)
11. Fleming, S. (2018). Good grub: Why we might be eating insects soon. *World Economic Forum* (online article on edible insect markets). [World Economic Forum](#)
12. World Economic Forum. (2020–2023). “Will you be eating insects soon?” and related Strategic Intelligence briefings on insects as future protein sources. [Stategic Intelligence](#)

13. Innovafeed / Washington Post. (2025). At the world's biggest bug farm, 10 billion maggots recycle food waste. *The Washington Post* climate solutions feature on industrial black soldier fly farms for feed. [The Washington Post](#)
14. Big Issue. (2025). Edible insects were once the future of food. Where did it go wrong? *The Big Issue* feature on edible insect backlash and conspiracy framing. [Big Issue](#)
15. The Guardian. (2025). 'Yuck factor': Eating insects rather than meat to help the planet is failing, study finds. *The Guardian* environment report on consumer resistance to insect-based foods. [theguardian.com](#)

The author has published over 4,600 AI-assisted papers at:

<https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Douglas-Youvan/research> . Google Scholar has indexed these preprints, and if you want a particular reference, the AI mode of a Google search (Gemini) has efficiently catalogued these preprints.